REMARKS

This response is intended as a full and complete response to the non-final Office Action mailed September 22, 2005.

Claims 8 and 10-12 are pending. Claims 8, 10, and 11 are amended.

In view of both the amendments presented above and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims now pending in the application are nonobvious over the cited references under 35 U.S.C. §103. Thus, Applicants believe that all the claims are allowable.

It is to be understood that Applicants, by amending the claims, do not acquiesce to the Examiner's characterizations of the art of record or to Applicants' subject matter recited in the pending claims. Further, Applicants are not acquiescing to the Examiner's statements as to the applicability of the prior art of record to the pending claims by filing the instant amendments.

Correction to Office Action by Examiner via Telephone

In a telephone call, Examiner Johnny Ma stated that an error was accidentally made in the Office Action and indicated that the correct references were U.S. Patent No. 6,606,746 to Zdepski et al. (not US 2002/0122598) and U.S. Publication No. 2002/0122598 for Ribas-Corbera et al. (not US 6,385,345).

35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 8

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,606,746 to Zdepski et al. ("Zdepski") in further view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0122598 for Ribas-Corbera et al. ("Ribas-Corbera").

For prior art references to be combined to render obvious a subsequent invention under 35 U.S.C. §103, there must be something in the prior art as a whole which suggests the desirability, and thus the obviousness, of making the combination. Uniroyal v. Rudkin-Wiley, 5 USPQ 2d 1434, 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Moreover, the mere fact that a prior art structure could be modified to produce the claimed invention would

PAGE 7/12 * RCVD AT 1/23/2006 6:54:15 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/26 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:+17325309808 * DURATION (mm-ss):03-00

not have made the modification obvious unless the prior art suggested the desirability of the modification. In re Fritch, 23 USPQ 2d 1780, 1783 (Fed. Cir. 1992); In re Gordon, 221 USPQ 1125, 1127 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

According to MPEP §2143, to establish a prima facie case of obviousness under §103, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, not in applicant's disclosure. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection, because the Office Action failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. The combination of Zdepski and Ribas-Corbera fails to teach or suggest all the claim elements.

Applicants' independent claim 8 recites:

> 8. A method, comprising:
> dividing an information section of a user interface into a plurality of macroblocks, the user interface including the information section and a display section, the information section including a plurality of background stripes, the macroblocks not crossing any border between two adjacent background stripes;
> forward transforming each macroblock to generate a transformed image;
> quantizing the transformed image to generate a quantized image; and
> encoding the quantized image to generate an encoded image of each macroblock. (Emphasis added.)

Zdepski discloses a method for displaying a graphical user interface by providing a compressed background picture and pasting insert pictures into the background picture in response to interactive program execution and/or user input. (Zdepski, abstract.) Such pasting one picture into another is not the same as the claimed dividing of an information section of a user interface into macroblocks that are encoded, where the macroblocks do not cross any border between two adjacent background stripes,

PAGE 8/12 * RCVD AT 1/23/2006 6:54:15 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/26 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:+17325309808 * DURATION (mm-ss):03-00

because no pasting is done. Specifically, each background stripe is separately encoded. Furthermore, the division of frames into a grid of squares in Zdepski is different than the claimed encoded information section, because macroblocks do not cross any border between two adjacent background stripes, while the grid is based on pixels. (Zdepski, col. 2, lines 29-39; Figure 4A.)

Ribas-Corbera discloses a method for selecting image data to skip when encoding digital video. Ribas-Corbera, like Zdepski, discloses the division of frames into a grid of squares based on pixels, which differs from the claimed encoded information section, because macroblocks do not cross any border between two adjacent background stripes. (Ribas-Corbera, page 2, [0029].)

As such, Applicants submit that independent claim 8 is not obvious and fully satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §103 and is patentable thereunder. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner's rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 10-12 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 8 and, thus, inherit the patentable subject matter of claim 8, while adding additional elements and further defining elements. Therefore, claims 10-12 are also patentable over the combination of Zdepski and Ribas-Corbera under §103 for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 8.

Claims 10 and 11

Claims 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Zdepski in further view of Ribas-Corbera, Vasconcelos ("Pre and Post-Filtering for Low Bit-Rate Video Coding" of record, hereinafter "Vasconcelos") and Lee et al. (U.S. Patent 5,748,789, of record, hereinafter "Lee").

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. For at least the reasons discussed above the Zdepski and Ribas-Corbera references fails to teach or suggest Applicants' invention as a whole. Furthermore, Ribas-Corbera, Vasconcelos and Lee fail to bridge the substantial gap between Zdepski and Ribas-Corbera and Applicants' invention.

The Ribas-Corbera publication discloses a method for selecting image data to skip when encoding digital video, but nowhere in the Ribas-Corbera publication is there any teaching or suggestion of the claimed macroblocks that do not cross any border

PAGE 9/12 * RCVD AT 1/23/2006 6:54:15 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/26 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:+17325309808 * DURATION (mm-ss):03-00

between two adjacent background stripes. The Vasconcelos reference discloses pre and post-filters for low bit rate video coding, but nowhere in the Vasconcelos reference is there any teaching or suggestion of the claimed macroblocks that do not cross any border between two adjacent background stripes. The Lee reference discloses transparent block skipping in object-based video coding systems, but nowhere in the Lee reference is there any teaching or suggestion of the claimed macroblocks that do not cross any border between two adjacent background stripes.

As such, Applicants submit that independent claim 8, and claims 10 and 11 which depend from claim 8, are not obvious and fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §103 and are patentable thereunder. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner's rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 12

The Office Action rejected claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Zdepski in further view of Ribas-Corbera and Eschbach (U.S. Patent 5,379,122, hereinafter "Eschbach"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

For at least the reasons discussed above the Zdepski and Ribas-Corbera references alone or in any operable combination fail to teach or suggest Applicants' invention as a whole. Furthermore, the Eschbach reference fails to bridge the substantial gap between Zdepski and Ribas-Corbera and Applicants' invention.

The Eschbach reference discloses decompression of standard ADCT-compressed images, but nowhere in the Eschbach reference is there any teaching or suggestion of the claimed macroblocks that do not cross any border between two adjacent background stripes.

As such, Applicants submit that independent claim 8, and claim 12 which depends from claim 8, are not obvious and fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §103 and are patentable thereunder. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner's rejection be withdrawn.

THE SECONDARY REFERENCES

The secondary references made of record are noted. However, it is believed that the secondary references are no more pertinent to Applicants' disclosure than the primary references cited in the office action. Therefore, Applicants believe that a detailed discussion of the secondary references is not necessary for a full and complete response to this Office Action.

PAGE 11/12 * RCVD AT 1/23/2006 6:54:15 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/26 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:+17325309808 * DURATION (mm-ss):03-00

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 8 and 10-12 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited.

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring adverse final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Lea Nicholson at (732) 530-9404 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 01/23/2006

Lea A. Nicholson
Reg. No. 48,346
(732) 530-9404

Patterson & Sheridan, LLP
Attorneys at Law
595 Shrewsbury Avenue, Suite 100
Shrewsbury, New Jersey 07702

PAGE 12/12 * RCVD AT 1/23/2006 6:54:15 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/26 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:+17325309808 * DURATION (mm-ss):03-00